

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

	1				
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/611,783	06/30/2003	Wade L. Hennessey	6783P102	1898	
	7590 04/10/200 OKOLOFF TAYLOR &	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY			SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R		
SUNNYVALE	, CA 94085-4040	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
		2145			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/10/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/611,783	HENNESSEY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145	

	Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 26 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. \(\times \) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:								
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	3) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. (b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for thin (b) above; if checket. A vary reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any sermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the Notice of Appeal was filed on	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);						
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or 			ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).								
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
/Jason D Cardone/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145								

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant defined an arena as "a specified set of nodes on a network." One of ordinary skill in the art is knowledgeable in mathematical set theory. In mathematical set theory, a set of items may consist of one or more than one item. Applicant stated an arena was a specified set of nodes. An arena therefore can be a single node. Applicant never claimed a grouping of nodes.

Applicant argued Auerbach failed to teach varying routing rules. Applicant never claimed variable routing.

Applicant argued Auerbach failed to teach if the client is a member of the arena, applying routing rules to the delivery of content to the client, including routing rules specific to the arena. Auerbach discloses using a specific network path. If a node routes along this path, then the node uses routing rules specific to that arena.

Applicant argued Auerbach failed to disclose specifying one or more edge routers that surround nodes on the network. In column 6, lines 41-42, a client places a request, and the request is filled by the video server most proximate to the client. The request is the input from the client. When the client places the request, the system determines which edge routers are closest. Column 7, lines 49-62 leaches the system setting proximities. This is "using the input to specify one or more edge routers that surround nodes on the network that are members of the arena", since the routers are the most proximate to the node or arena

Applicant's arguments regarding claims 10 and 19 are addressed above.